DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 262 CS 506 212

AUTHOR Tarnove, Elizabeth J.
TITLE Effects of Sexist Language on the Status and Self-Concept of Women.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Females; Language Role; *Language Usage; Mass Media; Mass Media Effects; Media Research; Self Concept; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Discrimination; Status
IDENTIFIERS Feminist Criticism; Language Sensitivity; Sexual Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The effects of sexist language on the status and self-concept of women is investigated in this paper, with particular emphasis on media sexism. The paper first examines the origin and effects of some of the most common ways in which language is used to reinforce existing sex stereotypes. The paper then discusses: (1) ways to weed out of daily discourse the most common forms of sexist language; (2) sexism in the print media; (3) sexism in the broadcast media; (4) arguments for and against the changing of the language to reflect non-sexist usages; (5) guidelines for change; and (6) evidence of change in American usages. Material for this discussion is taken from published literature filtered through feminist, psychological, and journalistic viewpoints. The paper argues that language molds ideas just as ideas mold the language and that language use must change for improved status and self-concept of women. The conclusion of the paper offers suggestions on how the media can become part of the solution to change language usage. Twenty-seven references are appended. (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295262

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Tarnove
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Effects of Sexist Language on the Status and Self-Concept of Women

Elizabeth J. Tarnove

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

CS506212

Abstract

The effects of sexist language on the status and self-concept of women was investigated, with particular emphasis on media sexism. This paper examines the most common forms of sexist language, along with ways to weed them out of the language; sexism in the print media; sexism in the broadcast media; arguments for and against the changing of the language to reflect non-sexist usages; guidelines for change; and evidence of change in American usages. Most of the material was gained from reviewing published literature from feminist, psychological, and journalistic viewpoints.

The findings show that language molds ideas just as ideas mold the language and that language use must change for improved status and self-concept of women.

Effects of Sexist Language on the Status and Self-Concept of Women

Spender (1980) wrote that English perpetuates stereotyping and, often, the invisibility of women through "the arbitrary and approximate categories of male-as-norm and female as deviant" (p. 142).

This paper will examine some of the most common forms of sexist language and how this language, as well as the "male-as-norm, female-as-deviant" categorization, remains a part of the American mass media.

It is not clear whether the mass media in America reflects, creates, or ignores public opinion. Perhaps it is not important. The real concern is that in continuing to perpetuate outmoded stereotypes of women, through both language and coverage, the media becomes part of the problem. The conclusion of this paper offers some suggestions on how the media can become part of the solution.

To dig at the roots of the problem, this paper will first examine the origin and effects of some of the most common ways in which language is used to reinforce existing sex role stereotypes. Following the general discussion, the paper will examine more closely how the media has, and has not, adapted to the changing role of women.

Common Sexist Forms

Male as Neuter

Although grammarians insist that the use of masculine pronouns and "man" to designate both sexes includes both men and women, research shows that these terms are generally interpreted to mean the male gender (Martyna, 1978; Miller & Swift, 1976).

In her study of the relationship of language to reality, Martyna (1978) asked people in a sample group what they thought of when they used the symbol "man". Men said they thought of themselves, but women said they felt excluded.

The association begins early. Aileen Pace Nilsen in 1973 found that young children consistently thought man meant males in such sentences as "man needs food" (Spender, 1980). Linda Harrison in 1975 found that science students thought of males when discussing the evolution of man and "they had little appreciation for the female contribution even when explicitly taught it" (Spender, 1980, p. 152).

Sociologists Joseph Schneider and Sally Hacker found similar results with college students in 1972. Some 300 students were asked to select pictures to illustrate a sociology textbook. One group was given chapter headings such as "Industrial Man" and "Political Man" while the other group was given corresponding, but non-gender-specific, headings such as "Industrial Life" and "Political Behavior" (Frank & Anshen, 1983; Miller & Swift, 1976). Analysis of pictures selected showed that "in the minds of the students of both sexes use of the word man evoked . . . images of males only . . . whereas the corresponding

headings without man evoked images of both males and females." (Miller & Swift, 1976, p. 21)

When the situation is reversed, men find the use of the generic she offensive. Miller and Swift (1976) wrote that male teachers in the 1960s claimed that "references to the teacher as 'she' were responsible in part for their poor public image and, consequently, in part for their poor salaries" (p. 33).

And, argued Miller & Swift, if the term man is truly neutral, how could the sentence describing "man's vital interests" as "life, food, access to females" make sense? The statement "man is the only primate that commits rape" is gramatically acceptable while "man, being a mammal, breast-feeds his young" is taken as a joke (1976, pp. 25-26).

Until 1850, he was not used as a neuter pronoun. Instead they was the neuter pronoun in sentences like "God should send everyone their heart's desire" in Shakespeare or "If a person is born of a gloomy temper . . . they cannot help it" by Lord Chesterfield in 1759 (Miller & Swift, 1980, p. 36).

In 1850, an Act of Parliament incorporated the recently invented generic he into the language used in parliamentary documents. "Words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females," it said (Miller & Swift, 1980, p. 37).

This act quickly influenced the laws and grammar books of English-speaking countries. It just as quickly interpreted for the convenience of males. As early as 1879, a move to admit female physicians into the all-male Massacusetts

Medical Society was blocked by the literal interpretation of the pronoun he in society by-laws (Miller & Swift, 1980).

Aside from legal interpretations favoring men, Kirsh (1983) argued that the perceived exclusion of women in the language is detrimental to an individual's feeling of self-worth. Noting the absence of women in textbooks concerned with "man's origins," "man's potential," or "political man," she added:

> Being so completely excluded from history and from serious educational study can communicate that women are not expected to contribute to society, aside from procreation related roles. The problem is continued and reinforced by such language use as considering "man" inclusive of all people and "he" sufficient for both "he" and "she". (Kirsh, 1983, p. 61)

Suffixes

Aside from the use of the generic he, the use of the suffixes (also known as diminutives) -ess, -ette, and -ix to differentiate women perpetuates the idea of male-as-norm, female-as-deviant.

While occupational titles such as poet/poetess or sculptor/sculptress may seem equivalent, the terms poet and sculptor are not gender-specific while the terms ending in -ess refer specifically to women. The fact that there are no corresponding terms to call attention to the gender of male poets and sculptors implies that males in these jobs are the norm (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

"The moral is clear," concluded Frank and Anshen. "People who write poetry are assumed to be men until proven otherwise, and people identified as women who write poetry are assumed to be less competent" (1983, p. 66).

Miller and Swift (1980) noted that the addition of such suffixes, even when intended as a courtesy, gives the basic form of the word "a predominately masculine sense with the unavoidable implication that the feminine-gender form represents a substandard variation" (p. 109).

The -ette suffix, when used to designate women, as in "majorette" or "Jaycee-ettes" (women's auxiliary to the Jaycees), also signifies imitation ("leatherette") or small size ("kitchenette"). "The upshot," wrote Miller and Swift, "is that terms like farmerette, majorette, Redskinette, etc., effectively define females as part of a sideshow" (1980, p. 111).

Sorrels (1983) advised checking the dictionary for meanings of words with these suffixes. "You will find the female form as the abnormal, diminished form of some strong, standard word" (p. 25). For example, major is a military officer, but no woman of that rank would be called a majorette. Governess during the time of Elizabeth I was the female equivalent of governor, but today governess means a live-in child-care specialist (Spender, 1980).

The solution is to drop these suffixes and use the standard word for both sexes (Lannon, 1985; Miller & Swift, 1980; Sorrels, 1983).

Denial of Adulthood

Until recently, black adult males in the American South were addressed as "boy" or by their first name. This practice toward blacks is applied to black adults of both sexes in South Africa (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

"Moving from racism to sexism, we must understand that calling a mature female 'girl' also puts her 'in her place,'" wrote Sorrels (1983, p. 52).

Age referent terms are used for both sexes. For men, the term boy is

generally used for a job or condition of inferior status such as busboy, shoeshine boy, and houseboy. There are more occupational titles for women which use the term girl, even when the equivalent male title ends in man. Examples are salesman/salesgirl and weatherman/weathergirl (Sorrels, 1983).

Women are encouraged to remain youthful, as any facial cream or hair-dye ad would suggest, but the price for remaining "girlish" is never to attain adulthood and never to be taken seriously (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

The solution is to apply parallel language. Boy and girl are designations for children, grown women should never be referred to as girls (American Psychological Association [APA], 1983; French, 1987; Kett & Underwood, 1978; Lannon, 1985; Miller & Swift, 1980). French (1987) sets age 18 as the cutoff that separates the men from the boys—and the women from the girls.

Gratuitous Modifiers

The use of the term lady is not as obviously patronizing as the use of the term girl. A lady, at least, is an adult. But the parallel term for lady is gentleman and, although there are many saleslades, there are no salesgentlemen. Lady can imply nobility or good manners ("she's a real lady"), but it can also be used with disrespect ("Hey, lady!") (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

As with girl, the solution is to use parallel terms—men and women, ladies and gentlemen (Kett & Underwood, 1978; Miller & Swift, 1980). Associated Press specifies that lady may be used "when it is a courtesy title or when a specific reference to fine manners is appropriate without patronizing overtones" (French, 1987, p. 122).

Lady is also used as a gratuitous modifier ("lady doctor," "lady lawyer") for

women in non-traditional careers. This is a reflection of the male-as-norm, female-as-deviant school of thought and should be avoided. Men in traditionally female careers are also stigmatized in this way ("male nurse," "male secretary").

In either case, it is better to let the pronouns or name of the specific individual indicate gender rather than drawing undue attention to the person's sex by preceding the occupational title with lady, woman, or male (Miller & Swift, 1980).

Naming Practices

Perhaps one of the most powerful influences on self-perception is one's name. The way women's names are used, or not used, is another indication of the inequality inherent in this culture.

Kirsh (1983) wrote that changing of a woman's name indicates powerlessness and that women taking on an identity as "Mrs. Him" achieve their social status vicariously through their husbands.

The custom of a woman's changing her name at marriage is not universal. Countering the assumption that women changed their names out of love for their husbands, Stapleton and Bright (1976) wrote:

> If changing your name proved your love for your partner, then American women love their husbands, while American men don't love their wives. On the other hand, it would mean that Egyptian, Chinese, and Icelandic coupled do not love each other at all since their tradition is for the women to keep their own names. Russian women are given a choice, so the returns would be mixed. And Spanish-speaking women keep their own names but add de Garcia

> or whatever their husband's name is at the end—meaning their love is only an afterthought . . . Changing the name is only a matter of tradition, not an act of love. (pp. 133-134)

And parts of that tradition are fairly recent in origin. The tradition of the title Mrs. indicating a married woman and of women taking on their husband's entire name (Mrs. John Jones rather than Mrs. Mary Jones) both began in the 19th century.

Until 1800, Miss was used to designate young females while Mistress (abbreviated to Mrs.) designated adult women. Marital status had nothing to do with these titles (Spender, 1980). While a married woman would take her husband's last name, she was not addressed by his first name. According to Miller and Swift (1976) Martha Washington would have been puzzled to receive a letter addressed to "Mrs. George Washington" for in her day, the title Mistress (Mrs.) was used for all adult women.

Miller and Swift (1976) felt the timing of the changing use of Miss and Mrs. coincided with the Industrial Revolution. Until that time, women lived with their parents until married and, in small villages, relationships were well known. With the loosening of these ties, it could not be told easily whether a woman was available or taken.

In addition to providing helpful information on a woman's sexual availability, the use of title to designate marital status applied pressure on women to marry "by lumping single women with the young and inexperienced" and served the needs of a patriarchal society "when a woman's availability for her primary role as helper and sexual partner was made an integral part of her identity" (Miller &

Swift, 1976, p. 99).

By the end of the 19th century, women were "required to surrender even more of themselves and their identity and become not just Mrs. Jane Smith but Mrs. John Smith" (Spender, 1980, pp. 27-28).

The custom of a woman's changing her name at marriage comes from English common law as spelled out by Blackstone when he wrote:

> By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law; that is, the very being or legal existence of the women is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband; under whose wing, protection, and cover she does everything. (Stapleton & Bright, 1976, p. 134)

In addition to reflecting the subordinate status of women, the practice of married women taking their husbands' names makes it difficult to trace women for research purposes. Spender (1980) wrote that this is one reason women's contributions are neglected in history books.

For those concerned with making history, Anderson (1987) recommends that women who have established their professional reputation under their original surname would be foolish to change their names at marriage because of potential difficulty in retaining contacts, clients, and credit.

Ms. was coined in the 1940s as an equivalent of Mr.—a courtesy title which did not indicate marital status (Miller & Swift, 1980). Although used by married women, Ms. is often treated as the equivalent (or substitute) for Miss, but not of Mrs. (Sorrels, 1983).

Sorrels (1983) felt that as long as Mr. is not indicative of marital status, it is inconsistent and therefore sexist to use any title but Ms. Other writing style guides recommend honoring each woman's individual preference (French, 1987) or dropping the titles altogether (Miller & Swift, 1980). The print media, particularly the New York Times has been very slow in adapting to changes in courtesy title use.

Sexist Language Use in the Media

The print media often have described women on the basis of looks, marital status, or motherhood, even when the information was clearly irrelevant to the story. For example, a woman running for political office might be described as the "35-year-old mother of four" even if she's a well-established lawyer. French (1987) gave the example, "Golda Meir, a doughty grandmother, told the Egyptians today . . ." (p. 237).

Men, in contrast, are rarely described as doughty grandfathers or as the "blond, vivacious, father of three".

Kett and Underwood (1978) wrote that these gratuitous modifiers are a reflection of the virgin/whore dichotomy. "The virtuous woman is easily identified by the parenthetical insertion of the number of her offspring immediately following her name" (p. 101). This practice has the effect of defining a woman in terms of her parenthood and distracts the reader from her professional capacity.

Although the Associated Press and other newsgathering organizations have recognized the need for more egalitarian coverage for women, there are still traditionalists in the field and their reporting and editing continue to reflect a sexist bias.

Perhaps the most glaring example has been the New York Times. This newspaper, which for nearly 100 years has been considered the newspaper of record and is kept in libraries for historical purposes (Heibert, Ungurait, & Bohn, 1985), refused to use the title Ms., except in quoted material, until June 1986 (Wade, 1986), and has not respected the wishes of married women who retain their own surnames (Degan & Pickens, 1982).

In contrast to its treatment of women, the Times resisted, yet finally adapted, when boxer Cassius Clay changed his name to Mohammed Ali. By the time basketball player Lew Alcindor changed his name to Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, the Times accepted it without fuss. But when tennis pro Nancy Lopez married and made it clear she would use her own surname, the Times insisted on referring to her as Mrs. Melton until she got a divorce (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

Just as historical women are difficult to trace due to name changes, so can forced name changes make it hard to keep track of a woman in the public eye. The Times' policy states that it refers to married women known primarily by their own surnames by those surnames, with the title "Miss". Elizabeth Taylor, for example, is "Miss Taylor" in the New York Times no matter how many times she marries (Degan & Pickens, 1982). Why, then, did the Times not honor Lopez' decision?

In reporting about vice presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro, who retained her own surname, the Times dogmatically, and inaccurately, referred to her as Mrs. Ferraro (Buresh, 1984; Wade, 1986).

Miller and Swift (1976) reported that the Times once referred to feminist Betty Frieden as "Mrs. on page 36 and Miss on page 46 of the same issue" (p.

101). And, after reporting that tennis pro Billie Jean King prefers to be called Ms. King, the New York Times referred to her in the rest of the story as Mrs. King.

Wire service style guides are significant not only because the reflect the attitudes of the national wire services, but because their style guides are used as standard references for newspapers and college journalism schools throughout the country. In fact, the cover of the latest edition of the Associated Press Stylebook proclaims it to be "The Journalist's Bible" (French, 1987).

The Associated Press and United Press International style guides have made some strides in the treatment of women in news stories, but Degan and Pickens (1982) pointed out some inconsistencies.

Prior to 1980, Associated Press used courtesy titles for women (Miss, Mrs., Ms.), but not for men (Angione, 1977). Since 1980, the Associated Press honors a woman's request not to use a courtesy title with her surname in a story if that is her preference (French, 1987; French, Powell, & Angione, 1980). However, the wire service instructs reporter to continue to assume individual women prefer the traditional titles of Mrs. and Miss unless she states otherwise (Angione, 1977; French, 1987; French, Powell, & Angione, 1980).

Although stating that "copy should not assume maleness when both sexes are involved", Associated Press accepts mankind as a "valid and acceptable" generic term (French, 1987, pp. 237-238). The wire service discourages gratuitous mention of marriage, motherhood, and physical appearance in coverage of women, but it objects to usages such as chairperson and prefer neutral titles (leader) or specific ones designating the sex of the persons discussed (chairman, chairwoman) (Degan & Pickens, 1982; French, 1987).

A research group at the Women Studies Program and Policy Center at George Washington University analyzed the coverage of significant women's issues—pay equity, enforcement of Title IX, the legal impact of the Equal Rights Amendment—in 10 newspapers and the Associated Press wire service. They found that the coverage focused only on the "controversy, confrontation and sensation" of the issues and, according to Buresh (1984) the report "demonstrated why some readers think the ERA has more to do with coed toilets and women on the battlefield than with legal rights" (p. 20).

The advent of women in broadcast journalism has been fairly recent owing to the long-held pretext that women's voices did not carry the authority of male voices in presenting serious news (Kirsh, 1983).

Even today, a large percentage of commercial voice-overs, even for household products, are men's voices (Maracek et al., 1978) and women newscasters are often relegated to human-interest stories (Kirsh, 1983).

Foerster (1982) wrote that along with revision of editorial policies on language, many newspapers have changed "the 'Women's Page' to incorporate all people and their range of interests" (p. 24). New section titles such as "People" or "Lifestyle" reflect this change of focus.

Other media observers feel these revamped sections are still edited primarily for women and reflect traditional ideas of women's interests:

> Have you ever seen a "man's section"... in a news publication? However, many people consider challenging the validity of the "women's section" strange. Therefore, world news, national news, business news, financial news, the classifieds, policy statements,

> and sports must form "men's news," while engagements, weddings, recipes, beauty contests, social debuts, coming-out parties, style shows, volunteer work, diet and exercise programs, women's auxiliaries, sewing, decorating, child care, and how to save must form "women's news." (Sorrels, 1983, pp. 54-55).

For example, the View section of the Los Angeles Times, a comparatively progressive feature section, devotes several pages each Friday to fashion news and other weekday sections to volunteering. It is the only section of the paper which, in society columns and captions of wedding pictures, refers to married couples or women by the husband's name ("Mr. and Mrs. John Jones," or "Mrs. George Bland").

It is also interesting to note how often prominent women are referred to by their first names in news headlines (Cory, Maggie, Liz, Fawn) though well-known men are accorded the dignity of their last names (Marcos, Carter, North). Oppenheimer (1988) noted this discrepancy for race as well as sex. He observed that while white candidates for the 1988 Democratic presidential nomination were called by their last name ("Dukakis", not "Mike"; "Gore", not "Al") black candidate Jesse Jackson was often referred to as "Jesse":

> Our use of language reflects our history, often without our awareness. When Jackson's ancestors arrived in this country as slaves they left behind their family names with their history; here they were only entitled to first names. If they carried last names at all is was simply as a designation of who their owners were. Although the practice is now beginning to change, it remains the rule in this

> country that a woman is given the use of her father's name until marriage, when she is expected to take her husband's name.
>
> Are we more comfortable calling our black and female leaders by their first names because these names are historically all that is properly theirs? Is the diminution intended, or merely unconcious? (Part II, p. 7)

Oppenheimer (1988) recalled that his former employer, then-Chief Justice Rose Bird of the California Supreme Court, was often referred to by outsiders as "Rose" or "Rosie" while her male colleagues were referred to as "Justice ---". It is hard to measure the effect of this diminution on the election or retention of women in high-level jobs, both in the public and private sector.

Objections to Change

Those objecting to non-sexist language, some grammarians and conservative columnists, do not deny the unfairness of sexist language but dismiss revisions as graceless, vague, and useless in changing the order of things.

Grammarian E. B. White, while acknowledging that language reinforces inequality, said that language crusaders confused sex difference with sex inequality. "True inequality does not lie in our tongue, it lies in our hearts and in our habits, and language is remarkably sensitive to both" (Miller & Swift, 1976, p. 125).

Stapleton and Bright (1976) countered that "language shapes thought as well as being shaped by it" (p. 134).

Conservative columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., reacting to the Scott, Foreman guidelines for non-sexist writing called the revisions in occupational titles a "syntactical cop-out" (Miller & Swift, 1976, p. 86). The authors followed this

quote with the thought that "the so-called cop-out" was "a useful resolution of syntactical cut-out" (p. 87).

Reacting to similar guidelines by McGraw-Hill, conservative columnist George Will called them "embarrasing," "banal," and "pathetic" and, after conceding that "the unequal status of women is an irrational waste of talent in most societies" he said that it would "not be rectified by people who waste time blaming and banning the kind of language" targeted by McGraw-Hill (Miller & Swift, 1976, p. 87).

The movement toward non-sexist language has been trivialized as "sispeak" in Time magazine and as the "libspeak tantrum" by a national columnist (Martyna, 1983). Those resisting non-sexist language as bringing de-sexing or resulting in such usages as "wopeople" and "personhole covers" also contribute to trivializing the intent of non-sexist language.

Buckley wrote that those issuing guidelines to substitute they for the generic he "want us to validate improper usage" and anyone using they rather than he "should not be hired as a professional writer" (Martyna, 1983, p. 29). As Miller and Swift pointed out in 1980, Buckley's hit list would include Shakespeare; Lord Chesterfield; and William Caxton, England's first printer.

Responding to critics, Miller and Swift (1976) wrote that the language is already being changed and that these changes will accelerate as women make gains in the professions, politics, and other fields:

> Eliminating sexism need not result in graceless language, as many people fear, Sensitive speakers, writers, and editors have been doing it consiously and well for years. Language that does not depend on

> abstraction is superior, for it is forced to be specific. The number of people refusing to surrender to linguistic sexism is relatively small, but it will grow. When that happens, the faults of those less sensitive will become even more apparent. (p. 152)

Getting Change

Non-sexist language does not have to be cumbersome. For example, "chairperson," an early substitute for the gender-specific term "chairman" has been replaced by "chair". "Newspaperman" becomes "reporter" and "workman" becomes "worker".

Research by sociolinguists shows that people generally resist forms they have difficulty pronouncing such as s/he, spokesperson, and chairer (Bate, 1978). Therefore, new usages must be comfortable and unselfconcious to be widely accepted and used.

The first step toward changing language is being aware that the current usage is sexist. Munter (1982) applies the "Munter Turnaround Test" to judge writing by substituting the term woman where man is customarily used. To make her point, she gave woman terms throughout her examples of sexist language (woman-made, a woman-sized job, businesswoman, etc.)

Numerous books cover language change in detail and others, including the APA and Associated Press guidelines, include sections on non-sexist usage.

Lannon's (1985) guidelines include six major points: (a) neutral terms (supervisor rather than foreman); (b) plural forms ("the managers . . . they" rather than "the manager . . . he"); (c) direct address (second person rather than third person); (d) referring to a specific person rather than a job title; (e) dropping of -ix,

-ette and -ess suffixes for women; and (f) avoiding the overuse of such pairings as s/he or he and she because they are awkward and call attention to themselves, defeating their own purpose of eliminating sexist usage.

In correspondence, Munter (1982) advised using descriptive terms (Dear Customer), job titles (Dear Sales Representative) or asexual salutations (Dear Friends) when the name or sex of the recipient is unknown rather than the traditional "Gentlemen" or "Dear Sir".

Kett and Underwood (1978) and Sorrels (1983) advised against using modifiers such as "lady lawyer" or overuse of meaningless terms like "pert" and "attractive" applied to women.

Signs of Change

The College Editing Department of John Wiley and Sons begins its guideline on non-sexist language with two illustrations from children's readers. In the first, from 1956, a girl offered to help to boys build a playhouse and is rebuffed by being told that girls can't hammer. The second selection, from 1974, shows a mother teaching her daughter to use a hammer and saw (1977).

Despite resistance to textbook change, publisher guidelines are making an impact. Content analysis shows today's books have fewer examples of blatant sexism than books of 20 to 30 years ago (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

Results in academic writing and newspapers are more uneven. The New York Times, until June 1986, refused to use "Ms." (Wade, 1986), but guidebooks such as the Associated Press' and APA's show progress toward equal treatment of women and some newspapers have adapted sex equality as part of their editorial policy (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

Frank and Anshen (1983) wrote that while the adaptation of non-sexist language in itself will not change society, it will have two effects: It will call attention to existing inequalities as society reevaluates old assumptions and it will end the male monopoly on determining linguistic usage. Women have already begun:

> to add to our language terms which describe women's experience from women's own point of view. This has enabled them to articulate their past oppression, and having a name for it has helped empower women to combat this oppression. Language is the common heritage of humans; all humans must share in shaping it and using it. (p. 93)

References

American Psychological Association. (1983). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C. P. (1987). The baby boomer's name game. New York: Perigee.

Angione, H. (Ed.). (1977). The Associated Press stylebook and libel manual. New York: Associated Press.

Bate, B. (1978). Nonsexist language use in transition. Journal of Communication, 28(1), 139-149.

Buresh, B. (1984, September). Critical mass. The Quill, pp. 14-20, 33.

College Editing Department of John Wiley & Sons. (1977). Wiley guidelines on sexism in language. New York: Author.

Degan, C., & Pickens, J. E. (1982). Taking bias out of news: Progress in public media. In International Association of Business Communicators, Without bias: A guidebook for nondiscriminatory communication (2nd ed.), (pp. 156-169). New York: Wiley.

Foerster, L. (1982). Regardless of sex: Toward communication free of sexual bias. In International Association of Business Communicators, Without bias: A guidebook for nondiscriminatory communication (2nd ed.), (pp. 23-44). New York: Wiley.

Frank, F., & Anshen, F. (1983). Language and the sexes. Albany: NY: State University of New York Press.

French, C. W. (Ed.). (1987). The Associated Press stylebook and libel manual. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

French, C. W., Powell, E. A., and Angione, H. (Eds.). (1980). The Associated Press stylebook and libel manual. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heibert, R. E., Ungurait, D. F., & Bohn, T. W. (1985). Mass media IV: An introduction to modern communication. New York: Longman.

Kett, M., & Underwood, V. (1978). How to avoid sexism: A guide for writers, editors and publishers. Chicago: Lawrence Ragan Communications.

Kirsh, B. (1983). Sex roles and language use: Implications for mental health. In V. Franks and E. D. Rothblum (Eds.), The stereotyping of women: Its effects on mental health (pp. 59-79). New York: Springer.

Lannon, J. M. (1985). Technical Writing (3rd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.

Maracek, J., Piliavin, J. A., Fitzsimmons, E., Krogh, E. C., Leader, E., & Trudell, B. (1978). Women as TV experts: The voice of authority? Journal of Communication, 28(1), 159-168.

Martyna, W. (1978). What does "he" mean? Use of the generic masculine. Journal of Communication, 28(1), 131-38.

Martyna, W. (1983). Beyond the he/man approach: The case for nonsexist language. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), Language, gender and society (pp. 25-37). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Miller, C., & Swift, K. (1976). Words and women. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Miller, C., & Swift, K. (1980). The handbook of nonsexist writing. New York: Lippincott & Crowell.

Munter, M. (1982). Avoiding sexism on the job: A test for bias-free writing and speaking. In International Association of Business Communicators, Without bias: A guidebook for nondiscriminatory communication (2nd ed.), (pp. 88-96). New York: Wiley.

Oppenheimer, D. B. (1988, April 28). In public life, first-name familiarity isn't always affectionate. Los Angeles Times, Part II, p. 7.

Sorrels, B. D. (1983). The nonsexist communicator: Solving the problem of gender and awkwardness in modern English. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Spender, D. (1980). Man made language. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stapleton, J., & Bright, R. (1976). Equal marriage. Nashville: Abingdon.

Wade, B. (1986, September). A triumph of reason: The men at the "Times" catch up with the times. Ms., p. 96.